

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 6, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 15 and 17-20 and. No new matter has been entered. Claims 14 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 15 and 17-20 are currently pending, of which claims 1-9 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Since Applicants have amended claim 14 and amended claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is traversed.

In the Office Action on page 2, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's related art (hereinafter, ARA) in view of Onuma (JP 05-345160, hereinafter "Onuma"). Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma and Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,395, hereinafter "Yamazaki"). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Lui (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123210, hereinafter "Lui"). Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013920, hereinafter "Hashimoto'920"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0083203, hereinafter "Hashimoto'203")

The rejection of claim 14 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because the rejected claim 14 is cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14.

The rejection of claims 15-17 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma and Yamazaki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 15 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 14 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “attaching aligning units to a plurality of side surfaces of a table” and “cleaning the aligning unit to remove material remaining on the aligning unit caused by the contact of the syringes and the aligning unit.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

As shown in Fig. 4 of Onuma, only one rod cell 6 is provided at one side of the substrate 2. On the contrary, in the claimed invention a plurality of aligning units are respectively attached in a plurality of sides of the table. That is, the rod cell 6 of Onuma is different from the aligning unit of the claimed invention. Thus, Onuma fails to teach or suggest at least “attaching aligning units to a plurality of side surfaces of a table.”

In Office Action of claim 16, the Examiner stated “ARA does not explicitly teach cleaning the aligning substrate after the syringes are raised to have a desired gap between the aligning substrate and the nozzles. However, cleaning the aligning substrate would have extended the life and use of the aligning substrate. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have cleaned the aligning substrate. One would have been motivated to do so in order to have extended the lifetime of the aligning substrate and to have reduced production costs.”

However, the Applicants do not agree with the Examiner’s statement. In the claimed invention, the aligning unit is cleaned at the time between the raise of syringes from the aligning unit and the applying of the material onto the aligning unit so that the material remained by contacting the syringe with the aligning unit is removed before conducting the applying of the material on the aligning unit. That is, in the claimed invention the aligning unit is cleaned to detect the clear image of the alignment pattern on the aligning unit, not to have extended the life and the use of the aligning unit. Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest “cleaning the aligning unit to remove material remaining on the aligning unit caused by the contact of the syringes and the aligning unit.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 and claim 17, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references. Because the rejected claim 16 is cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

The rejection of claim 18 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Lui is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 18 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claim 15, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 19 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Hashimoto'920 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 19 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claim 15, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 20 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Onuma, in view of Hashimoto'203 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 20 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claim 15, which is allowable.


Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: May 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant